DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 036 SP 039 466

AUTHOR Katayama, Andrew D.

TITLE Innovative Mentoring Programs in Teaching Educational Psychology.

PUB DATE 2000-04-28

NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28,2000).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Educational Psychology; Elementary Secondary Education; Graduate Students; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Mentors; Preservice Teacher Education; Student Teacher Attitudes; Summer Programs

ABSTRACT

This paper examines two sections of split-level educational psychology classes that were introduced at a large public university in the Midwest in the summer of 1999. Approximately half of the students enrolled in the classes were traditional undergraduate educational psychology students, and the other half consisted of practicing teachers who received graduate credit in advanced educational psychology. These courses were offered as experimental 12-week summer sessions that were designed for the graduate students to mentor the preservice teachers as well as share their experiences as they related to the theories discussed in class. After 8 and 12 weeks, respectively, evaluations were given to the students to assess their attitudes toward this course. Two separate versions were used: one for the undergraduates and one for the graduates. A combination of quantitative and qualitative methods was used to describe the students' reactions, attitudes, and evaluations of the course, which in general, yielded positive and consistent feedback from both the mentors and the mentees. (Author/SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Running Head: INNOVATIVE MENTORING PROGRAMS

ED 446 036

Innovative Mentoring Programs in Teaching Educational Psychology

Andrew D. Katayama

West Virginia University

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the

American Educational Research Association

April 2000

New Orleans, LA

Contact Information:

Andrew D. Katayama

Department of Advanced Educational Studies

Allen Hall 504-O

Morgantown, WV 26506-6122

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. D. Katayama

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP039466

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This paper examines two sections of split-level Educational Psychology classes that were introduced at a large public university in the Mid-west in the summer of 1999. Approximately half of the students enrolled in the classes were traditional undergraduate Educational Psychology students and the other half consisted of practicing teachers who received graduate credit in Advanced Educational Psychology. These courses were offered as experimental 12-week summer sessions that were designed for the graduate students to "mentor" the pre-service teachers as well as share their experiences as they relate to the theories discussed in class. After eight and twelve weeks respectively, evaluations were given to the students to assess their attitudes of this course. Two separate versions were used: One for the undergraduates and one for the graduates. A combination of quantitative and qualitative methods was used to describe the students' reactions, attitudes, and evaluations of the course, which, in general, yielded positive and consistent feedback from both the mentors and the mentorees.

Innovative Mentoring Programs in Teaching Educational Psychology

Classically defined, a mentor is someone; perhaps a college professor, family member, coworker, or a friend who inspires you, helps you, and shows you the ropes of your surroundings in a new working environment (Portner, 1994). In education, mentors are usually veteran teachers who support colleagues and help those who are new to the profession to become acclimated to the everyday activities that take place in the schools. Ultimately, mentors can help the mentorees by encouraging them and helping them become better teachers (Newton, Bergstrom, Brennan, Dunne, Gilbert, Ibarguen, Perez-Selles, & Thomas, 1994).

Most of the recent support for mentoring new and pre-service teachers can be attributed primarily to two plausible factors. One is the high rate of attrition among new teachers. According to the 1996 report of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, up to one third of new teachers in the US leave the profession within their first three years. One reason for this, according to the commission, is the classical "sink-or-swim" mentality toward teacher education. Teaching, as we know it, is an "art" that takes insight, knowledge, and many years of experience to develop (NCTAF, 1996). The kink here is that not many teachers are remaining in the profession long enough to develop the "art" of teaching because they have no initial or ongoing support base (Colton, & Sparks, 1993). A second plausible reason that educational leaders are beginning support mentoring is their recognition of the unprecedented number of veteran teachers who are nearing retirement (Torres-Guzman & Goodwin, 1995). This is a problem projected across the U.S.

So then, what do mentors do? Mentors build and maintain relationships with their mentorees based on mutual respect, trust, and professionalism (Newton, Bergstrom, Brennan, Dunne, Gilbert, Ibarguen, Perez-Seles, & Thomas, 1994). Relating behaviors create an

environment that allows mentors to develop a genuine understanding of their mentoree's ideas and needs and encourages them to ask questions. A second part of the mentorship is reported to be more difficult. In terms of guiding, mentors wean their mentorees away from dependence by guiding them through the process of reflecting on decisions and actions for themselves and encouraging them to construct their own informed teaching and learning approaches (Portner, 1998).

How can this be realized in the present study? Well, based on the recommendations of Manthei (1990) certain activities should be present in order for a mentorship to be successful. Three characteristics in particular (there are six in all) that built the premise of practice in the present study were that mentoring (1) is collegial and ongoing, (2) stimulates the personal, critical, and creative thinking about how to teach and how children learn, and (3) helps to develop self-reliance for the mentoree and self-assurance for the mentor (Manthei, 1990).

The concept of mentoring holds a vehicle for educational reform. It is reported that more than 30 states in the U.S. have mandated beginning teacher support as a part of their teacher education programs (Portner, 1994). In response to the challenge imposed by these mandates, increasing numbers of educational programs are implementing mentoring programs to help their pre-service teachers as well as new teachers persist and develop beyond their first year of teaching (Maynard, 1997). Additionally, both the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the nation's largest teachers' unions, are in accord in their encouragement of the establishment of peer review and assistance programs under which all beginning teachers would be assigned a mentor. With this in mind, the present study asks the question: Why not get the pre-service teachers started a little earlier, such as in their teacher

education courses (Educational Psychology, in particular) to allow them to become familiar with the mentoring process?

The Present Study

In the fall of 1998, a new course in Educational Psychology was developed and proposed as a split-level Educational Psychology course at a large public university in the Mid-west. The purpose of this course was to combine undergraduate pre-service teacher education students along with in-service teachers together in an innovative mentoring program.[1] The proposal to introduce this experimental course was approved during the spring of 1999 and implemented in the summer of 1999. The course was approved for the instructor to teach two split-level sections of Educational Psychology. This was based on previous summer enrollments for both classes. Based on a three-year summer enrollment history for the undergraduate Educational Psychology and graduate Advanced Educational Psychology classes, it was projected that these split-level classes needed to accommodate approximately 35-40 graduates and 30-35 undergraduates respectively. Obviously, one large class of 35 graduates and 35 undergraduates is just too large. So therefore, two separate sections were approved. By design, caps of 18 undergraduates and 20 graduates were established to help control for equal numbers of undergraduates and graduates in each section. As it turned out for the first class meetings, the enrollments were not exactly equal. However, both sections enrolled approximate numbers (n=20 undergraduates, n=18 graduates enrolled in section one; n=16 undergraduates, n=16 graduates in section two). The reason there were twenty undergraduates enrolled in section one was due to schedule conflictions with other

[1] Note: for the purposes of this study, the term pre-service teachers is used to describe the traditional undergraduate teacher education students, usually in their third year of the teacher education program. The term in-service is used to describe the traditional graduate level student who already have a Bachelors degree and are currently teaching in the public or private school systems.

courses and the time of the second section and therefore, approval to enroll in section one was granted by the instructor for two undergraduate students.

As those of us in higher education know, it is typical for students to drop a course throughout the term. These two split-level courses were no exceptions. As a result, the final enrollments for the two sections were affected by five students dropping the courses (four undergraduates and one graduate). Fortunately, both sections maintained approximate numbers (n=18 undergraduates, n=17 graduates remained in section one; n=14 undergraduates, n=16 graduates in section two). Two undergraduate students from each section and one graduate student from the first section had dropped the course for unspecified reasons.

Upon completion of the course, the undergraduate pre-service teachers received three credit hours in EDPSY 305 Educational Psychology and the graduate in-service teachers received three credit hours in EDPSY 515 Advanced Educational Psychology. This experimental course was designed with the notion that the in-service teachers would serve as "mentors" to the pre-service teachers, to share their experiences as they relate to the theories that we discuss in class. How was this done? The following is a general extraction and compilation of the course syllabus describing the course activities and criteria that was used for evaluation. In this mentoring program, students were evaluated in the following areas: *Paired Group Presentations, Research Participation, Quizzes, and a Final Exam.* Graduate students were required to complete an additional research paper by writing about a learning theory (e.g., schema theory). A brief description of the assignments are presented below:

- *Paired-Group Presentations* - Paired-groups (comprised of two undergraduates and two graduates) chose a presentation topic from a list of topics from the course syllabus (e.g., classical conditioning vs. operant conditioning) and presented on the assigned dates from

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the schedule throughout the term. Groups earned up to 60 points on the presentations. A few groups consisted of more than two graduates or undergraduates due to an odd number of students that was not devisable by four.

- *A Research Project* was administered as a required part of class. This project took place in class and covered class-related information. Students earned up to 20 points for participating in this University supported research project (IRB approved). Students gave their consent to participate in this study as part of class.
- *Five Quizzes* were administered during the first six weeks of the term. These quizzes were individually graded. Each quiz was worth 15 points. Items on the quizzes covered information from the chapter readings, lectures, and group presentations. The lowest quiz was dropped at the end of the term.
- *Take Home Final.* A take home final was passed out to students in the tenth week of the term (two weeks prior to the final class). Students worked in their mentoring groups and had two weeks to work together (in and out of class) before turning in the final. Each group was responsible for turning in <u>one</u> final. The final was related to the topics discussed in class as well as from the assigned readings from the final chapters (e.g., the pro's and con's of ability grouping). The groups earned up to 60 points on the final.

In addition to the listed activities, graduate students were required to complete one of the following research assignments:

- *A Research Article Critique* from an approved research journal (e.g., Contemporary Educational Psychology) was completed by a specified date on the syllabus. Students were provided with explicit criteria for the research article critique (following APA, 4th

edition guidelines). Graduate students earned up to 20 points on the research article critique.

Or they could opt to complete:

- *A Research Position Paper* that discussed how the student uses a psychological theory or principle in their classes with their students. The title of the paper was " How I Use Psychology to Teach My Class." Graduate students were provided with specific criteria for the research position paper. Students earned up to 20 points on the research position paper.

I have consistently observed in previous classes that students would often approach me about the possibilities of completing both assignments with hopes of receiving "double points" or "extra credit." For example, it has never failed that some student will ask, "So, if I do both research assignments can I get forty points?" I'm not sure, but I think the term "over achiever" applies to these particular students, but, it still makes me wonder why this happens. I 'm sure that this happens at other schools as well, doesn't it?. Therefore, the graduate students in these classes were instructed to do one or the other, and though they may do both, they would ONLY receive credit for one assignment. Other than completing one of the research writing assignment presented above, the graduates and undergraduates had the same expectations for completing the assignments. The graduates were evaluated using an eight-point scale whereas the undergraduates were evaluated using a 10-point scale.

Evaluation

At the end of the eighth week, an instructor created attitudinal survey was administered to all students in both classes. A separate version was used for the undergraduates and graduates

respectively (see Appendix A for examples). The survey administered to the undergraduates asked questions focusing on their experiences as a mentoree by probing their attitudes about a) the class in general, b) their learning as a result of having mentors in class with them, c) having teachers in the same class with them, d) the mentoring climate that took place in the course thus far, and e) whether or not the student would be inclined to take another split-level course in the future. The survey administered to the graduates asked similar questions, but geared more toward their experiences as the mentor, probing their attitudes about a) the class in general, b) their learning as a result of their mentoring, c) having undergraduates to mentor, d) the sharing that took place in the course thus far, and e) whether or not the student would be inclined to take another split-level course in the future. At the end of the 12-week period another formal course evaluation (faculty senate) was administered.

In summary of the qualitative responses, the students' feedbacks from the instructor-created attitudinal survey were positive for the most part, with more response coming from the undergraduates. For many of the graduate students, they indicated that the class challenged them to think about their teaching practices and to question the theories within the textbook. But, perhaps the most favorable comments have come from the undergraduates as many of them have expressed the feelings of enhanced learning by real-life experiences shared by their group members (mentors) rather than relying on the textbook or the instructor's example's alone. It also has allowed the undergraduates to network with the teachers, gaining valuable information regarding tangible issues (e.g., extra-curricular activities, contracts, school policies, how to manage a behaviorally challenged student, just to name a few). As an interesting side note, one of the undergraduate students had commented on how she was able to obtain a job thanks in part

to the connections she made with a few of the teachers (mentors) in the class. Qualitative and quantitative exploratory analyses are still being conducted on the remaining data.

Positive feedback was provided from both the graduates and undergraduates. Many of the graduate mentors felt that they have been challenged to think about their own teaching practices and to question the theories within the textbook. Why are behavioral theories effective in teaching first grade? Or, why isn't a certain behavioral techniques effective in teaching first grade? These were some of the verbal comments made in class from the graduate mentors. That was nice to hear, but perhaps the most complimentary verbal comments have come from the undergraduates as many of them expressed the feelings of enhanced learning by real-life experiences shared by their group members (mentors) rather than relying on the textbook or the professors example's alone (with all due respect). It also has allowed the undergraduates to "network" with the teachers, gaining valuable information regarding tangible issues (e.g., extra-curricular activities, contracts, school policies, how to manage a behaviorally challenged student, just to name a few). One of the undergraduate students even secured a job for the upcoming year thanks to the connections she made with some teachers (graduate mentors) in the class.

Analysis

Frequencies and descriptive statistics for each of the sections were carried out on SPSS, version 9.0. Specifically, cross tab analyses were conducted on five questions from the instructor survey and on six questions from the senate survey across status (undergraduate vs. graduate). Descriptive statistics for the total sample population of this study included 32 undergraduates (49%) in the combined sample: 18 in section one and 14 in section two, and 33 graduates (51%) in the total sample: 17 in section one and 16 in section two. Thirty-five students completed the course in section one (54%), and 30 students completed the course in section two (46%). There

were 19 males in the total sample (29%), 45 females (70%), and one student who did not report gender and was counted as "missing".

Cross tab analyses on the instructor survey (administered in the 8th week of the term) combined the sections across status: Undergraduate (UG) vs. Graduate (G). A five-point Likert scale was presented on a legend where 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neither Agree or Disagree, 4=Disagree, and 5=Strongly Disagree and was used to help students respond to the items on the survey. Tables 1-5 present crosstab frequencies for each response on the five questions analyzed from the instructor surveys. To best describe the five questions analyzed in this survey, the italicized words indicate that the first word was used in the UG's survey, whereas the second italicized word was used in the G's survey. For example, the first questions on the instructor surveys were "I enjoyed having *mentors/mentorees* in class share *their/my* experiences." Because these questions are parallel and reflective of their opinions about the other, the UG's statement was presented with the first set of italicized words and the G's with the second set. The following questions included: "I felt class was more challenging having G's/UG's in class with me,"
"I felt intimidated having the G's/UG's in class with me," "I learned more having the G's/UG's in class with me than without," and "I would like to take another split level class."

Tables 1-5 Present Crosstabs of Questions 1-5 by Grade Status (G or UG) On Instructor Surveys.

Table 1
Question 1: I enjoyed having mentors/mentorees in class with me to share their/my experiences.

	Status (G or UG) Undergrad	Grad	Total
1.00	15	8	23
2.00	11	16	27
3.00	5	8	13

4.00	1	1	2
Total:	32	33	65

Table 2
Question 2: I felt class was more challenging having G's/UG's in class with me.

	Status (G or UG)		Total
	Undergrad	Grad	
1.00	5	5	10
2.00	13	10	23
3.00	11	10	21
4.00	1	4	5
5.00	2	4	6
Total:	32	33	65

Table 3
Question 3: I felt intimidated having G's/UG's in class with me.

	Status (G or UG)		Total
	Undergrad	Grad	
1.00	1	3	4
2.00	8	3	11
3.00	3	3	6
4.00	8	6	14
5.00	12	18	30
Total:	32	33	65

Table 4
Question 4: I feel that I've learned more having the G's/UG's in class with me than without.

	Status (G or UG)		Total
	Undergrad	Grad	
1.00	11	10	21
2.00	11	14	25
3.00	5	7	12
4.00	4	2	6
5.00	1		1
Total:	32	33	65

Table 5
Question 5: I would take another Split-Level class.

	Status (G or UG)		Total
	Undergrad	Grad	

1.00	12	11	23
2.00	17	18	35
3.00	1	3	4
4.00	2		2
5.00		1	1
Total:	32	33	65

Cross tab analyses were conducted on the senate surveys as well (administered in the 12th and final week of the term). These surveys also combined sections across status: Undergraduate (UG) vs. Graduate (G). However, on these surveys, the five-point Likert scale was presented in reverse order as the Instructor survey. Had I have checked the senate survey before constructing the instructor survey, I would have made my scale consistent with the senate survey! Therefore, the legend on this survey was 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Agree or Disagree, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree. Again, this legend was helpful for students to respond to the items on this survey. Tables 6-11 present crosstab frequencies for each response for the six questions analyzed from the senate surveys. Contrary to the instructor surveys, the senate survey was administered as one format. Therefore, the same form was completed by both the UG's and G's. The six questions analyzed from the senate survey included the following: The course was well planned (in reference to the split-level format), Students were treated fairly (G and UG) by the instructor and by one another, The instructor encouraged all class members to participate (G and UG) in the class discussions and activities, The course format was useful for application of theories/principles presented and discussed in class, My overall rating of the course is:, and My overall rating of the instructor compared to other instructors that I've had at _____ University.

Tables 6-11 Present Crosstabs of Questions 1-6 by Grade Status (G or UG) On Senate Surveys

Question 1: The course was well planned (in reference to the split-level format).

	Class		Total
	UG	G	
n	3	2	5
a	4	9	13
sa	25	25	50
Total:	32	36	68

Question 2: Students were treated fairly (G and UG) by the instructor and by one another.

	Class		Total
	UG	G	
n	1	3	4
a	4	8	12
sa	27	25	52
Total:	32	36	68

Question 3: The instructor encouraged all class members to participate (G and UG) in the class discussions and activities.

	Class		Total
	UG	G	
a	6	10	16
sa	26	26	52
Total:	32	36	68

Question 4: The course format was useful for application of theories presented and discussed in class.

	Class		Total
	UG	G	
n	1	3	4
a	10	15	25
sa	21	18	39
Total:	32	36	68

Question 5: My overall rating of the course is:

	Class		Total
	UG	G	
avg		3	3
above avg	7	9	16
excellent	25	24	49
Total:	32	36	68

Question 6: My overall rating of the instructor compared to other instructors that I've had at ########## University.

	Class	Total

	UG	G	
avg		4	4
above avg	11	14	25
excellent	21	18	39
Total:	32	36	68

Discussion and Conclusion

Based on the descriptive responses of the students as a whole, I feel that this structure of the split-level Educational Psychology mentoring program poses a win-win situation for both the teachers and the soon-to-be teachers in the class. Beginning with the instructor surveys, the majority of the students (both UG's an G's) have responded favorably concerning their experiences in the class. While very few students found the class to be more challenging than a traditional class, the majority tended to describe their experience a moderately more challenging to very comparable to a traditional class. A few more undergraduates reported a sense of intimidation of having the graduate mentors in the class with them than the other way around. But as the open-ended comments suggest, that was an "initial" feeling and that once the term progressed, most of them no longer felt intimidated. The vast majority of the students felt that they learned more in this class as a result of having the mentor/mentoree in class with them than without. Likewise, the majority of the students indicated that they would like to take another split-level course in the future. This finding was pre-qualified by the acknowledgement that there would be separate requirements (e.g., additional research paper for the G's) and separate grading scales for each group (e.g., UG's=10 point scale; G's=8 point scale).

From the senate surveys, the majority of students felt that the split-level course was well planned and that they were treated fairly, by the instructor and by one another. The majority also

felt that the instructor encouraged all class members to participate in the discussions and activities. The majority of the students felt that the course format was useful for application of the theories presented in class. For the overall rating of the course, the UG's were slightly more complementary than the G's. The same was true regarding the overall rating of the instructor when compared to other instructors at that particular institution.

Open-ended feedback was also collected on both surveys. Some of the responses that the UG's had were: "At first, I was intimidated by the presence of graduate students. In the end, I feel their comments were an important contribution to the class." Another students stated, "…having graduate students in class was fun and interesting. My only question is 'will I take this same class again for my masters?'" This was a good question, one that I hadn't thought of. Another UG student said, "I liked the interaction with the G's. Although I was intimidated at first, I realized that they shared a lot of the same fears I do—it ended up making me feel more confident about my abilities." Another commented, "At first, I thought 'what in the world are graduates doing in class' but as the semester went on, I enjoyed working with them and learning from their experiences…this was a great class!" Another UG said, "I thought the split levels were a great idea. The practical examples and advice given by the G's ws something you cant get from a textbook…" and another student stated that, "There was some instances where few UG's had the opportunity to speak. I feel there is an intimidation factor involved in this type of class environment". This comment pained a common picture of what I observed during the first two weeks of the term, therefore I wanted to be sure I asked this very question on the instructor survey.

To my surprise, the comments from the G's were fewer and less detailed, which may not be a good thing. Some of the comments were: "I really enjoyed the format of the class. I learned

a lot from teachers sharing their experiences with the class and learning why I use certain theories to teach my classes." Another commented, …"the assignments and readings were enhanced by the great discussions and activities…I enjoyed working with others." While another brings up the point, "We did not actually spend a lot of time working together in the planning stages." I would speculate that some groups spent significantly greater time together in planning their presentations than others. I also could infer that perhaps some of the graduates felt the burden of "having to do carry the UG's" because they were after all, the "experienced teachers." In a similar light, another student commented that "I would've like to have had more applied theories with in the classes." Again this comment can be read that some G's were expecting more of a traditional lecture-base class to absorb information rather than mentor. This expectation would be normal and should be something to consider when offering a split-level course. Regarding the planning of the course, one student said "This class was well planned. It was like learning from our own experiences… I learn more when I have to be accountable for what I do."

A few things that I have learned from teaching the split-level classes are that each student has a preferred mode for learning and that many students can benefit from a "non-traditional" mode of learning. Speculative as it may be, I would generalize the UG's as being much more likely to be intimidated by having G's in class with them. This may be one possible explanation why more UG's than G's ended up dropping the course from day one. But, for those that remained in the classes, once they realized that they were not competing with the G's, but rather, working with them, soon became acclimated after about three weeks of working together. This was just my feeling for what the climate was during the term. Therefore, I believe that the UG's were quite flexible in their learning mode by welcoming the G's to share and expand upon the

course content with their work experiences. I'm not so sure the same generalization can be made about the G's. Although they learned the same material, they may have sensed an additional responsibility to help the UG's learn the concepts and application of each concept throughout the term. Here, the results were mixed. Some G's willingly accepted the mentoring responsibility and did so with pride, whereas others were not as adamant. Perhaps a few reasons why some G's were not overly excited to engage in the mentoring at first might have been due to a lack of experience with mentoring. Obviously, if they have never mentored another teacher, they would not feel comfortable doing it a class setting. Another reason may have been due to their initial expectation of the class. That is to say, they were expecting a traditional, lecture-base class. Or perhaps, they may have been annoyed of having UG's in the same class as them. With this hypothetical mentality, surely a sense of superiority would be diminished by "having" to work with UG's. Whatever the case, I believe that some sort of "pre-training" mentoring workshop for the G's would prove to be helpful. This would address the benefits of "mentoring" and would be helpful before enrolling into a split-level course like this study.

Limitations

It should be noted that this is the first time that I have taught this class in the split-level format. Actually, it is the first time a split-level class had been taught in the department at this particular institution. So obviously, I have a lot to learn from this way of teaching and learning. My experience with these split-level mentoring courses has been extraordinary. I look forward to improving this way of teaching Educational Psychology in the future to fit the students needs and best interests. This format may not be for every instructor of Educational Psychology, but it certainly is a practical way to keep the lines open between pre-service teachers and practitioners in the field. It should also be noted that there are extreme biases involved in a study of this

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

nature. One major limitation of this type of descriptive study of an experimental course is that it is based on the impression of one instructor and the reactions of students from two classes that the instructor has taught. Therefore, the descriptive results of this study cannot be generalized beyond the two sections of split-level classes examined in this study. Likewise, the results of this study cannot be generalized beyond the instructor of these classes. This is merely one instructor's experience in teaching Educational Psychology in a split-level mentoring program; a program that has some definite benefits as well as some major limitations. Overall, this study was a great experience from the instructors view, and I look forward to doing it again sometime in the near future.

References

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). Becoming a critically reflective teacher. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Colton, A. B. & Sparks-Langer, G. M. (1993). A conceptual framework to guide the development of teacher reflection and decision making. Journal of Teacher Education, 44, 45-54.

Manthei, J. (1990). Mentor teacher preparation inventory and guide for planning and action. Boston: The Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning.

Maynard, T. (1997). . An Introduction to Primary Mentoring. USA: Cassell Academic Press.

National Commission for Teaching and America's Future (1996). What Matters Most: Teaching For America's Future. (http://www.tc.columbia.edu/~teachcomm/).

Newton, A. Bergstrom, K., Brennan, N., Dune, K., Gilbert, C. Ibarguen, N., Perez-Selles, M., & Thomas, E. (1994). Mentoring: A recsource and training guide for educators. Andover, MA: the Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands.

Portner, H. (1998). Mentoring new teachers. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc. A Sage Publications Company.

Torres-Guzman, M. E., & Goodwin, Al L. (1995). Mentoring bilingual teachers. (Occasional papers in bilingual education, No. 12). Washington D.C.: The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Appendix A
Example Instructor Surveys (UG and G)

EDUC 305 Educational Psychology COURSE SURVEY (Pre-service Teachers)

Reply to each of the questions by circling the number that best represents your thoughts of the course:
1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Nether Agree or Disagree 4=Disagree 5= Strongly Disagree

1. I enjoyed working in small groups preparing for the presentations.	1 2 3 4 5
2. I enjoyed learning from the presentation groups.	1 2 3 4 5
3. I liked to learn from other students rather than exclusively from the professor.	1 2 3 4 5
4. I enjoyed having mentors in class with me to share their/my experiences.	1 2 3 4 5
5. I felt class was more challenging having Graduate mentors in class with me.	1 2 3 4 5
6. I felt intimidated having Graduate mentors in class with me.	1 2 3 4 5
7. I feel that I've learned more having the Graduate mentors in class with me than without.	1 2 3 4 5
8. I would take another split-level course with graduate mentors as long as long as my expectations were not the same as theirs (different grading scales, etc.).	1 2 3 4 5
9. I enjoyed taking this instructor for this class.	1 2 3 4 5
10. Gender:	Male Female

Comments/Suggestions:

EDUC 515 Advanced Educational Psychology COURSE SURVEY (In-service Teachers)

Reply to each of the questions by circling the number that best represents your thoughts of the course:
1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Nether Agree or Disagree 4=Disagree 5= Strongly Disagree

1. I enjoyed working in small groups preparing for the presentations.	1 2 3 4 5
2. I enjoyed learning from the presentation groups.	1 2 3 4 5
3. I liked to learn from other students rather than exclusively from the professor.	1 2 3 4 5
4. I enjoyed having undergraduate mentorees in class with me to share their/my experiences.	1 2 3 4 5
5. I felt class was more challenging having to mentor undergraduates in class with me.	1 2 3 4 5
6. I felt intimidated having to mentor undergraduates in class with me.	1 2 3 4 5
7. I feel that I've learned more having the mentored undergraduates in class with me than without.	1 2 3 4 5
8. I would take another split-level course with undergraduate mentorees even if my expectations were higher than theirs (different grading scales, etc.).	1 2 3 4 5
9. I enjoyed taking this instructor for this class.	1 2 3 4 5
10. Gender:	Male Female

Comments/Suggestions